

vigorously made against the practice of using this patronage list, as it is debarring carpenters who are loyal and have been citizens of this country for the last twenty-five to thirty years, also a large percentage of the members being ex-service men. Owing to this approved list being used certain carpenters are being given employment by the various contractors on the scheme, thereby making it impossible for others to get employment.

There is a clear case of discrimination which is now being presented to the ministry. I do not know all the facts but I should like to know if the minister will appoint a board of arbitration to investigate this charge of discrimination in connection with the construction of a public building under the jurisdiction of this government. If it is possible to do this, why has it not been done?

Mr. GORDON: The bill has not been passed.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Will the minister undertake that when it is passed he will make a proper investigation of this complaint and if these patronage lists are being used, see to it that they are done away with at once and provide a fair opportunity to carpenters and other craftsmen to obtain employment on jobs of this kind irrespective of political affiliations?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Has my hon. friend thought of the possibility of having the public accounts committee called together and of referring this complaint to it? This has to do with the expenditure of money on public works and the complaint of discrimination could be immediately dealt with in that way.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I hope it will be dealt with in some way.

Mr. GORDON: If this bill becomes law and a proper complaint comes before me, there will not be any doubt about my taking action.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): This is a proper complaint. I will furnish the minister with a copy in writing of this complaint which comes from a responsible brotherhood local.

Mr. GORDON: I am not challenging that

Mr. MITCHELL: Would that particular complaint come within the jurisdiction of the present act or as it will be when this amendment passes? I think it will be found that the legislation is so circumscribed that it will be just too bad for these carpenters when they endeavour to have a board of conciliation appointed.

Mr. BURY: I should like to add a word or two to what I said before. I have the utmost sympathy with the principle that where in any particular industry generally there prevails a condition of low wages or poor working conditions the tariff should be used as a weapon of correction but I do not think that the tariff could be used as a weapon to end every strike which might occur. I suppose in nine cases out of ten strikes occur in individual establishments and I am afraid it would be absolutely impossible to use the tariff as a weapon in this connection, as suggested by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps). However, it can be used and I think it should be used to see that conditions in industries which are protected are such that the workers receive a proper wage and work under proper conditions.

Mr. HEAPS: That is a very good suggestion to come from the hon. member. If we had fair working conditions it would not be necessary to appoint these boards. The evidence submitted before the price spreads committee and commission showed that in the most highly protected industries the poorest working conditions prevailed. Before the government gives such tremendously increased tariff protection it should see that the conditions prevailing in any industry are such as to entitle that industry to the protection. If fair working conditions prevail I am sure that there will be but very few disputes; with fair working conditions I am sure we could get along without the legislation now before us.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Should this legislation pass, is it intended to set up regulations and forms to govern complaints which might be made? Is there to be any particular form of complaint regarded as being necessary?

Mr. GORDON: The section does not prescribe any set form that would have to be followed by an applicant. Anybody can complain and the simplest sort of a letter, the simpler the better, would do.

Mr. HEAPS: In case of a complaint, is it compulsory for the department to appoint a board of arbitration?

Mr. GORDON: When a complaint is received under this section, the minister may, if it seems to him expedient, appoint a person under the Inquiries Act to inquire into the matter. I do not think the hon. member himself, with all his desire to advocate the position of labour, would suggest that the provision should be mandatory, because this